DOCKET NO.: MSFT-2824 / 183209.05 PATENT

**Application No.:** 10/691,723 **Office Action Dated:** June 7, 2006

## REMARKS

Claims 1-21 were rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 17, 24, 27, 29-32, 39, 41, 42 and 46-49 of U.S. Patent No. 6,670,934 Bl.

Applicants have filed herewith a terminal disclaimer to overcome the obviousnesstype double patenting.

Claims 1-2, 4, 7, 9-10, 14-15 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by McLay et al., (hereinafter McLay), US 4,072,825.

Applicants have amended the independent claims to incorporate the limitations recited claims 3, 11 and 16.

Claim 1, for example, recites:

wherein the effect is displaying an image on a display device.

Claim 9, for example, recites:

wherein the effect is displaying an image.

Claim 14, for example, recites:

wherein the effect is displaying an image on a display device associate with each computing device.

Applicants submit that the above claim limitations are not taught or suggested by McLay et al. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection of independent claims 1, 9 and 14. Inasmuch as claims, 2, 4, 7, 10, 15 and 20 depend from claims 1, 9 and 14, Applicants submit that they also patentably define over McLay et al.

Claims 9-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Applicants submit that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 101 is improper. Nevertheless, in order to further prosecution, Applicants have amended the claims and submit that the amended claims fall within the guidelines.

Claim 14 was objected to because of apparent informalities. The examiner maintins that claim 14 has "graphically overlapping and overlaid lines reciting the same limitations."

Page 6 of 7

PATENT

**DOCKET NO.:** MSFT-2824 / 183209.05

**Application No.:** 10/691,723 **Office Action Dated:** June 7, 2006

Applicants submit that the claim is proper in the present form. The claim recites:

a plurality of computer readable instructions capable of executing on the computer for selecting one of the logical groups;

a plurality of computer readable instructions capable of executing on the computer for selecting an effect to be applied to the selected logical group;

A group must be selected before an effect can be applied to the selected group. If the examiner believes that the claim is incorrect after considering the above, Applicants respectfully request that he contact the Applicants' representative to discuss the same.

## **CONCLUSION**

Michael J. Swop

Registration No/38,041

Applicants' representative submits that claims 1-2, 4-10, 12-15 and 17-21 are in condition for allowance.

Date: September 6, 2006

Woodcock Washburn LLP One Liberty Place - 46th Floor Philadelphia PA 19103

Telephone: (215) 568-3100 Facsimile: (215) 568-3439